

V1 PART B: PRIVATE PLAN CHANGES

CONTENTS

1 Scope of Report..... 2

2 Our Approach..... 2

3 Hearing and Parties Heard 3

4 General Grounds for Rejection or Acceptance 3

5 Schedule 1, clause 99(2) Amendments 6

6 B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Reverse Sensitivity 6

7 B4.3 Residential and Business Development 6

8 C12 Living Zone Rules – Subdivision..... 8

9 Appendix E37..... 9

10 Appendix E38..... 9

11 Other Matters 9

Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments..... 10

Appendix 2: Evidence and Legal Submissions Presented 14

1 Scope of Report

- [1] This Recommendation Report prepared by the Independent Hearing Panel (IHP) relates to general submissions and further submissions that were received on Part B of the Intensification Planning Instrument (IPI) – Variations to Private Plan Changes 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76 and 78 to the Operative Selwyn District Plan.
- [2] The IHP members were:
- Andrew Willis
 - Lindsay Daysh
 - Raewyn Solomon
 - Rob van Voorthuysen (Chair)
- [3] The Section 42A Report¹ was:
- Section 42A Report, Part B of Intensification Planning Instrument – Variations to Private Plan Changes, Report on submissions and further submissions, Authors: Jocelyn Lewes and Rachael Carruthers, 19 April 2023
- [4] Our recommended amendments to the Private Plan Changes (PPCs) are set out in Appendix 1.

2 Our Approach

- [5] The Section 42A Report helpfully outlined relevant background information on a number of matters:
- Procedural issues relating to incorrectly or categorised summarised submissions;
 - Withdrawn submissions²;
 - Clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 matters;
 - Clause 99(2)(b) of Schedule 1 matters;
 - Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (RMA-EHS)
 - Resource Management Act 1991;
 - National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD);
 - National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL);
 - National Planning Standards; and
 - An overview of PPCs 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76 and 78.
- [6] We adopt that background information without generally repeating it.
- [7] We note that Part B of SDC's IPI varies each of PPC requests 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76 and 78, and has been prepared in response to clause 34 of the RMA-EHS. This is achieved through the introduction of a new Living MD1 zone (which implements the mandatory MDRS) to replace the Living Z zone sought in each PPC. Also, while PPC 73 was included in Part B of the IPI, no change was made to it as SDC considered that urban form connectivity and reverse sensitivity

¹ No Section 42A Reply Reports were provided for the Variation 1 hearings.

² CSI and RWRL (PCV1-0024); CSI and RWRL (PCV1-0024.FS002), CSIPL (PCV1-0033.FS002), and CGPL (PCV1-0034.FS002).

matters formed the basis of a qualifying matter, making the land west of Dunns Crossing Road inappropriate for MDRS.

- [8] The Section 42A Report authors provided a description of each submitter's request. We adopt those descriptions without repeating them here. It is therefore imperative that readers of this Recommendation Report also read the Section 42A Report.
- [9] Further submitters are not generally referred to in this Recommendation Report, because further submissions are either accepted or rejected in conformance with our recommendations on the primary submissions to which they relate.

3 Hearing and Parties Heard

- [10] The Variation 1 Part B hearings coincided with the Variation 1 Part A rezoning hearings for Rolleston, Lincoln and Prebbleton. The parties who wished to be heard and who appeared at the hearings were:

Sub #	Name
PCV1-0007	Lincoln Voice
PCV1-0013	TRRG
PCV1-0025	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited
PCV1-0027	Foodstuffs

- [11] The witnesses and counsel we heard from are listed in Appendix 2. A copy of their legal submissions and evidence is held by the Council. We do not separately summarise that material here, but we refer to or quote from some of it in the remainder of this Recommendation Report. We record that we considered all submissions and further submissions, regardless of whether the submitter or further submitter appeared at the hearing and whether or not they were represented by counsel or expert witnesses.
- [12] Cross examination is allowed through the intensification streamlined planning process (ISPP)³. No submitter requested to cross-examine the witnesses of any other submitter.⁴

4 General Grounds for Rejection or Acceptance

- [13] There are a large number of submissions that the Section 42A Report authors recommended should be rejected for the following reasons:
- As the Variations are initiated by SDC, in accordance with the requirements of the RMA-EHS, under clause 3.5(7)(b)(ii) of the NPS-HPL the provisions of the NPS-HPL do not apply to this process;
 - The Variations to the PPCs are a requirement of the RMA-EHS, in order to apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, unless there is a valid qualifying matter. In the absence of an RMA-EHS s77 evaluation by a submitter as to how and why a qualifying matter applies, there is no basis upon which to decline specific variations;
 - The matters raised in the submission were beyond the scope of the various Variations;
 - Opposed a variation provision but specified no relief;

³ RMA s98(4).

⁴ Our IPI Minute 1 required notice of a wish to cross-examine to be lodged with the SDC Hearing Secretary 5 working days prior to the hearing.

- Supported a variation provision and sought no change to it;
- Opposed policies that implemented the mandatory requirement of the RMA-EHS to include Policies 3, 4 and 5 as set out in clause 6 of Schedule 3A of the RMA-EHS;
- Opposed Residential Density Objectives B4.1.3 and Policy B4.1.14 within the Variations which are a mandatory requirement of the RMA-EHS; and
- Neither supported nor opposed a provision and did not specify any wording amendment.

[14] We accept those recommendations and the relevant submissions are listed in the table below.

[15] In a similar vein we adopt the Section 42A Report authors' recommendations to accept in whole or in part submissions that supported and sought no change to various Variation 1 provisions.

[16] The relevant chapters of the ODP to which the following submissions relate are:

- A 4.5 Townships and ZonesB1.1 Land and Soils
- B1.2 Water
- B2.1 Transport Networks
- B2.2 Utilities⁵
- B2.3 Community Facilities (and Reserves)
- B3.1 Natural Hazards
- B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Objectives
- B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Zones
- B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Noise
- B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Glare
- B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Traffic
- B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Building Design
- B4.1 Residential Density – Objectives
- B4.3 Residential and Business Development⁶
- C4 Living Zone Rules – Building
- Proposed Living MD Rules (Rule 4.19)
- Appendix E11
- Appendix E38⁷
- Appendix E42
- Definitions

⁵ In particular PCV1-0022 Transpower who sought that the MRZ does not contain, and is not traversed by, the National Grid.

⁶ Readers should note that some specific submission points are dealt with in section 7 of this Recommendation Report.

⁷ See also Section 10 of this Recommendation report in relation to the submission of Four Stars and Gould (PCV1-0010.002)

■ Non-District Plan Matters⁸

[17] The submissions falling into the above 'general grounds for rejection or acceptance' are:

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0003	Greg Tod	001, 002
PCV1-0004	Jo Brady and Stuart Auld	001
PCV1-0005	Kathleen Liberty	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007
PCV1-0006	Jason Horne	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029, , 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036, 037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042, 043, 044, 045, 046, 047, 048, 049, 050, 051, 052, 053, 054, 055, 056, 057, 058, 059, 060, 061, 062, 063, 064, 066, 067, 068, 069, 070, 071, 072, 073, 074,
PCV1-0008	G and J Eastwick	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016
PCV1-0009	Urban Estates	001, 002, 003, 004
PCV1-0010	Four Stars and Gould	003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 106, 107, 018, 019
PCV1-0011	Dunweavin	001, 002
PCV1-0012	Jocelyn Humphreys	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021
PCV1-0013	TRRG	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 204, 205, 206, 027, 028, 029. 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036, 037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042
PCV1-0014	Margaret Morrison	001
PCV1-0017	Chris Barrett	001, 002, 003, 004, 006, 007, 008
PCV1-0018	CRC	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007
PCV1-0019	Elene Anderson	001, 002
PCV1-0020	Nicki Turner	001, 002, 003, 004, 006
PCV1-0021	Fiona Thirring	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008
PCV1-0022	Transpower	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008
PCV1-0023	Stephanie Broomhall	001, 002
PCV1-0026	Tracey MacLeod	001
PCV1-0027	Foodstuffs	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007
PCV1-0028	Waka Kotahi	001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 007, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036, 037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 042, 043, 044, 045, 046, 047, 048

[18] Submitters listed in the above table should refer to the Section 42A Report if they wish to know the reason why a specific submission point has been rejected or accepted.

[19] However, given that counsel for PCV1-0013 Trices Road Rezoning Group (TRRG) appeared at the IPI Hearing 09 – Prebbleton we address that here. Counsel was opposed to the specification of a minimum net density of 15hh/ha in Prebbleton Outline Development Plan – Area 5. The outcome sought was to retain a minimum net density of 12hh/ha which was said to be consistent with Commissioner Thomas' decision on PC72. Counsel for TRRG advised that

⁸ In relation to the submission points of Waka Kotahi on restrictive building covenants which is an 'out of scope' matter. We also note that SDC does not utilise covenants (a private legal mechanism) to vary the provisions of the SDP.

the PC72 technical assessments for transport and servicing were based on 12hh/ha. However, at the IPI Hearing 09, Ms Carruthers advised that the SDC's servicing assessments were in fact based on 15 hh/ha.

- [20] Counsel for TRRG said other constraints for the site primarily related to the required retention of a large hedge on the roadside which meant houses would need to be set back to avoid shading. We do not find that to be a sufficient constraint on achieving the desired 15hh/ha.
- [21] Consequently, we decline to recommend a net density of 12 hh/ha for PC72.

5 Schedule 1, clause 99(2) Amendments

- [22] Under clause 99(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA⁹ the recommendation of the IHP must be related to a matter identified by the panel or any other person during the hearing, but are not limited to being within the scope of submissions. For ease of reference our cl.99(2) recommendations are:
- a) PC 69, Appendix E37, Outline Development Plan Area 9, Land Use: insert the words 'for subdivision or additional residential units' at the end of the first sentence to clarify that an ITA is only required for applications that would result in additional residential units; and
 - b) PC 72, Appendix E42, Prebbleton Outline Development Plan – Area 5, Land Use and Density: delete the reference to approximately 320 households, consequential to our recommendations on PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC.

6 B3.4 Quality of the Environment – Reverse Sensitivity

- [23] For the following submissions we adopt the Section 42A Report authors' recommendations and reasons. This results in no change to the PPC provisions amended or inserted by Variation 1.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0027	Foodstuffs	008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015

- [24] We note that Foodstuffs considered that the introduction of medium density housing could cause existing and currently acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic to be felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. However, Foodstuffs provided no specific evidence, planning evaluations or s32AA evaluations in relation to any of the Variations to support the relief they sought¹⁰.

7 B4.3 Residential and Business Development

- [25] For the following submissions we adopt the Section 42A Report authors' recommendations and reasons. This results in no change to the PPC provisions amended or inserted by Variation 1.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0006	Jason Horne	065
PCV1-0007	Lincoln Voice	001

⁹ A new Part 6 was inserted into Schedule 1 of the RMA by Part 2 the RMA-EHS.

¹⁰ That the effects of supermarkets are explicitly recognised and that supermarket activities cannot be restricted and opposed in the future by new neighbouring MRZ residents expecting an unrealistic residential amenity.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0010	Four Stars and Gould	001
PCV1-0015	CCC	001
PCV1-0016	SDC	001 ¹¹
PCV1-0017	Chris Barrett	005
PCV1-0018	CRC	008
PCV1-0020	Nicki Turner	005
PCV1-0025	RIDL	001

[26] In particular we agree with the Section 42A Report authors that:

- SDC's request to rezone 184 Hamptons Road (a 1,612m² sliver of land that was excluded from PC68) should be rejected as there is no scope within this process to include additional land;
- In relation to RIDL's submission on the variation to PC69, there are no limits on land and/or building area associated with development in the Business 1 zone within the SDP¹², and so there is no need to amend the ODP as requested. There is scope within the SDP and the proposed ODP to identify the size of the commercial area at the time of subdivision;

[27] In relation to PC69 we heard from Lincoln Voice¹³. Lincoln Voice is an appellant to PC69.

[28] A 'Statement' from Lincoln Voice was pre-circulated and at the IPI Hearing 08 – Lincoln, Denise Carrick spoke to the 'Statement'.¹⁴ The 'Statement' says that *"The central focus of Lincoln Voice's appeal is that PC69 is located on highly productive land, and should therefore be subject to evaluation under the NPS-HPL."* In response we note:

- SDC's advice is that under NPS-HPL clause 3.5(7)(b)(ii) the PC69 land is not subject to the NPS-HPL because it is land that is *'subject to a Council initiated, or an adopted, notified plan change to rezone it from general rural or rural production to urban or rural lifestyle'*;
- It is not up to us to second guess whether or not the SDC should have included PC69 in Part B of Variation 1. It was required to do so under the RMA-EHS. Consequently the land will be zoned 'medium density' should PC69 eventually be approved by the Environment Court (we note PC69 is subject to appeal);
- If Lincoln Voice take issue with SDC's decision to include PC69 in Part B of Variation 1 then we understand they have legal avenues of challenge available to them including judicial review; and

¹¹ Also SDC's submission on Appendix E42 for PC68 (PCV1-0016.002).

¹² Refer to C16.9 and C16.10 Commercial Developments.

¹³ Lincoln Voice also submitted on Part A of Variation 1 opposing the change from GRUZ to MRZ within the PC69 area and sought the deletion of DEV-LI8. Those submissions were included in the Section 42A Report for IPI Hearing 01 Residential. Lincoln Voice was also a further submitter to the District Wide, Area Specific and Qualifying Matters (IPI Hearing 05), General (IPI Hearing 01), Subdivision (IPI Hearing 03), Transport (IPI Hearing 04) and Commercial and Mixed Use Zones (IPI Hearing 06) matters. However, the IHP agreed to consider their relief at the Lincoln Hearing (Hearing 07).

¹⁴ The IHP had previously granted leave for Lincoln Voice to present their consolidated case at IPI Hearing 07 – Lincoln.

- Consequently, in terms of Part B of Variation 1, the only issue for us is to consider whether the land subject to PC69 should be zoned Living Z¹⁵ or Living MD1¹⁶. In that regard we find the land should be zoned Living MD1 under PC69 as that would be consistent with the intent of the RMA-EHS that all relevant residential zones in Tier 1 territorial authorities are rezoned to incorporate the MDRS unless a qualifying matter applies. In saying that we reiterate that the overall merits of PC69 will be evaluated by the Environment Court in due course.

- [29] In relation to PC71, Four Stars and Gould sought that the entirety of the site that was requested in PC71, including the land under CIAL's 50 dBA Ldn Noise Contour, be included in the Variation. The appropriateness of residential activity under the noise contour was rejected by the PC71 Commissioner who heard the initial PPC request. We note that the same relief was sought by the submitter (DPR-0344) in the Rolleston rezoning hearing and the Hearing 30.1 Hearing Panel also recommended rejecting that relief.
- [30] We agree with the Hearing 30.1 Hearing Panel that it would be inappropriate to rezone land within the 50 dBA Ldn Noise Control Overlay from GRUZ to enable residential development (in this case Living MD1 zone) as to do so would rely on an as yet unknown outcome of CRC's review of the airport noise contours. It would also not give effect to Objectives 5.2.1(f) and (g) and Policy 6.3.5(4) of the CRPS.
- [31] In relation to PC73, as SDC decided not to apply the Living MD1 zone to the PC73 land, on the grounds that urban form connectivity and reverse sensitivity matters form the basis of a qualifying matter, we agree that the submission points of Jason Horne, Chris Barrett and CRC should be accepted. We recommend that CCC's submission is rejected as PC 73 was not amended through in Variation 1.

8 C12 Living Zone Rules – Subdivision

- [32] For the following submissions we adopt the Section 42A Report authors' recommendations and reasons.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0015	CCC	002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009

- [33] CCC requested that any subdivision of a residential site where an ODP applied should have a density not less than 15 hh/ha. We agree with the Section 42A Report authors that the relief sought by CCC would be an appropriate response to the intent of the RMA-EHS in the Living MD1 zone, however applying that relief to all residential zones where an ODP applied, in all townships in the district, would go beyond the scope of the RMA-EHS as it only applies to the urban environments of Rolleston, Lincoln and Prebbleton.
- [34] We therefore recommend that:
- the ODPs for PC68, PC69, PC71, PC72, PC75, PC76, and PC78 are amended by introducing a new requirement to achieve a minimum net density of 15 households/ha in the Living MD1 zone, as shown in Appendix 1.

¹⁵ We note the PC69 Decision also included three areas zoned Business 1.

¹⁶ We understand that the Living MD1 zone provisions implement the MDRS contained within the RMA-EHS.

[35] We adopt the Section 42A Report authors' 32AA assessment set out in paragraphs 24.6 to 24.10 of the Section 42A Report.

[36] Regarding the above recommendation, we note that a failure to achieve 15 hh/ha would not comply with Rule 12.1.3.58 and so would continue to result in NC activity status through Rule 12.1.7.10.

9 Appendix E37

[37] For the following submissions we adopt the Section 42A Report authors' recommendations and reasons.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0016	SDC	003

[38] SDC sought that the terminology within the ODP narrative should be amended to be consistent with the language of the MDRS by relacing 'Households' with either 'Sites' or 'Residential Units' as appropriate. We find that to be sensible.

[39] We recommend that:

- a) the narrative of ODP Area 9 in Appendix E37 is amended to ensure consistency of terminology with the MDRS as shown in Appendix 1.

10 Appendix E38

[40] For the following submissions we adopt the Section 42A Report authors' recommendations and reasons.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
PCV1-0010	Four Stars and Gould	002

[41] Four Stars and Gould requested that the ODP for PC71 be amended to incorporate the land under the current 50 dBA Ldn Noise Contour. We discussed that relief in respect of 'B4.3 Residential and Business Development' and make the same finding here.

11 Other Matters

[42] For the avoidance of doubt, we recommend that the amendments outlined in Appendices 1 to 8 of the 'Section 32 Report, Part B – Variation 1 to PC68, PC69, PC71, PC72, PC73, PC75, PC76, PC78 to the Operative District Plan' are accepted, except as otherwise amended in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report.

[43] No other matters were brought to our attention.

Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments

***Note to Readers:** Only provisions where amendments are recommended are shown below. Insertions are shown underlined and deletions are shown ~~struck through~~. For context, amendments as proposed in Variation 1 as notified are shown in black text. Amendments proposed as a result of this Recommendation Report are shown in blue text.*

Amendments to the Operative District Plan

B4.3 Residential and Business Development – Specific Policies for Townships – Rolleston

Policy B4.3.76

Ensure that development within each of the Outline Development Plan areas identified on the Planning Maps and Appendices within Rolleston addresses the specific matters relevant to each ODP Area number listed below:

...

Outline Development Plan Area 14¹⁷

- Provision of a mix of low and medium density housing areas with a minimum net density of ~~12~~ 15¹⁸ households per hectare averaged over the ODP area.

Outline Development Plan Area 15¹⁹

- Provision of a minimum net density of ~~12~~ 15²⁰ households per hectare averaged over the ODP.

Outline Development Plan Area 16²¹

- Provision of a minimum net density of ~~12~~ 15²² households per hectare averaged over the ODP Area;

Private Plan Change 68

Appendix E52

OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN NARRATIVE – PREBBLETON – SOUTH WEST

Density

The ODP area is to achieve a minimum of ~~12~~ 15²³ households per hectare. It supports a variety of lot sizes within the Living Z MD1 framework to achieve this minimum density ~~including medium density and comprehensive development.~~

...

¹⁷ PC76
¹⁸ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC
¹⁹ PC75
²⁰ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC
²¹ PC78
²² PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC
²³ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

Private Plan Change 69**Appendix E37****OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA 9****Land Use**

The development area shall provide for a maximum of 1710 ~~households~~ residential units²⁴ beyond which an Integrated Transport Assessment shall be required in association with any resource consent application for subdivision or additional residential units.²⁵ In addition, the development area shall achieve a minimum net density of ~~12~~ 15²⁶ household per hectare, averaged over the area. The zoning framework supports a variety of site sizes to achieve this minimum density requirement. Should this area be developed in stages, confirmation at the time of subdivision of each stage, and an assessment as to how the minimum net density of ~~12~~ 15²⁷ household per hectare for the overall area can be achieved, will be required.

...

Private Plan Change 71**Appendix E38****OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA 14****Density Plan**

The ODP area shall achieve a minimum net density of 15 households per hectare, ~~averaged over the northern portion area; and 12 households per hectare averaged over the mid and southern portions of the area~~.²⁸

The zoning framework supports a variety of site sizes to achieve this minimum density requirement. Should this area be developed in stages, confirmation at the time of subdivision of each stage, and an assessment as to how the minimum net density of ~~12 or~~²⁹ 15 households per hectare ~~respectively for each overall area~~³⁰ can be achieved, will be required.

...

²⁴ PCV1-0016.003 SDC

²⁵ CI99(2)(b) amendment to clarify that an ITA is only required for applications that would result in additional residential units

²⁶ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

²⁷ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

²⁸ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

²⁹ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³⁰ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

Private Plan Change 72**Appendix E42****PREBBLETON OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – AREA 5****Land Use and Density**

A minimum net density of ~~12~~ 15³¹ households per hectare (~~approximately 320hh~~)³² shall be achieved, averaged over the Site.

...

The ODP allows for existing dwellings and related curtilage /garden areas integrated in the final layout if this is required. Larger lots, within the scope of the ~~LZ~~ LMD1 zone, may be required adjacent to areas where existing trees and or dwellings are retained to allow for slightly larger setbacks avoiding shading. Any reduction in density resulting from this integration can be offset by an increase in ~~medium~~ higher density areas, or by identifying larger sites retaining existing dwellings and related garden areas as future development areas, provided at subdivision stage, it can be illustrated how these sites can be further subdivided to achieve an average density of ~~12~~ 15³³ hh/ha. Consent notices on these larger site titles may be imposed to require future potential subdivision at this ultimate required density.

...

Private Plan Change 75**Appendix E37****OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA 15****Density Plan**

The ODP area shall achieve a minimum of ~~12~~ 15³⁴ household lots per hectare. ODP Area 15 supports a variety of allotment sizes within the Living ~~Z~~ MD1 framework to achieve this minimum density requirement. Should this area be developed in stages, confirmation at the time of subdivision of each stage, and an assessment as to how the minimum density of ~~12~~ 15³⁵hh/ha for the overall ODP can be achieved, will be required.

ODP Area 15 predominately ...

- To meet the minimum ~~12~~ 15³⁶hh/ha density requirement and development yield.

³¹ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³² CI99(2)(b) amendment, consequential to PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³³ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³⁴ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³⁵ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³⁶ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

Private Plan Change 76**Appendix E37****OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA 14****Land Use**

The development area shall achieve a minimum net density of [42 15](#)³⁷ households per hectare, averaged over the area. The zoning framework supports a variety of site sizes to achieve this minimum density requirement. Should this area be developed in stages, confirmation at the time of subdivision of each stage, and an assessment as to how the minimum net density of [42 15](#)³⁸ households per hectare for the overall area can be achieved, will be required. The site supports some medium density housing within the centre of the area and in proximity to the identified reserve.

...

Private Plan Change 78**Appendix E37****OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA 16****Density**

The ODP area is to achieve a minimum of [42 15](#)³⁹ households per hectare. It supports a variety of lot sizes within the Living [Z MD1](#)⁴⁰ framework to achieve this minimum density.

...

³⁷ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³⁸ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

³⁹ PCV1-0015.002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 and 009 CCC

⁴⁰ CI16(2) amendment to reflect the new zone name

Appendix 2: Evidence and Legal Submissions Presented

Appearances

Sub #	Submitter	Author	Role
PCV1-0007	Lincoln Voice	Denise Carrick	Representative
PCV1-0013	TRRG	Katherine Forward	Counsel
PCV1-0025	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	Jo Appleyard Greg Akehurst Fraser Colegrave Jeremy Phillips	Counsel Economics Economics Planning
PCV1-0027	Foodstuffs	Alex Booker	Counsel